



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

them in a state of isolation one from the other. At every step they have been to them as symbols of war. Buddha was the first of human beings who preached universal charity and gave the seal of peace. But, inasmuch as his doctrine was exclusively Aryan, he made no converts without, except amongst barbarous nations, or those destitute of religion. The west was closed to him. Christianity, which came later, sealed by its metaphysics and its worship the union of Aryan and Semitic thought, and conquered all the western Aryans. But the Semites have not accepted it, in spite of its doctrine of one personal God, nor the Aryans of Asia, in consequence of that doctrine. It has converted but few Jews or Mussulmans, and not a single Indian. So the two primitive sources continue to roll down their waters in two separate channels. Wherever there has been an attempt to unite them, it has not up to the present time succeeded in absorbing the two others and forming a third current of religious ideas, on which the people of the west can be the only ones borne on. Is it to the Veda, the Bible, is it to the Buddhist or the Christian church that will one day belong the glory of uniting all the nations? Science is dumb on these problems. Its object is in the past, not in the future. Altogether, we must believe that the victory will remain to that which turns out to be the most true of these fundamental theories, unless, indeed, another should arise, which can embrace them all in its synthesis, and shall reunite in one universal church all the human races, and all their religions.

THE PLURALITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.*

Few things are more observable in the scientific world than the change of tone which has taken place within the last few years on the subject of authority. Everywhere the supremacy of facts is now recognised, and the only loyalty even professed by the more advanced minds is not a faithful adherence to tradition, but unswerving fealty to the truth. The battle fought and won by astronomy in the days of Galileo, was in truth but the beginning of the war, and alone would have proved utterly inadequate to teach men of science their strength, or theologians their weakness. This was shown in the reception accorded to geology, whose stupendous revelations from the page of nature were long expected to bend to a written record. It is still shown in the

* The Plurality of the Human Race. By Georges Pouchet. Translated and edited by Hugh J. C. Beavan, F.R.G.S., F.A.S.L. London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts.

criticisms provoked in certain quarters by anthropological investigations. We are free to speculate on the age of rocks, and even to inquire into the succession of plants and animals; but man is a sacred, and, therefore, a forbidden subject. His origin, antiquity, and special relationships have all been settled by a tribunal that laughs at induction, and treats opposing facts with derision, and, indeed, regards the mere tendency to independent thought on such momentous questions as *prima facie* evidence of irreligion. Till very recently, even the greatest minds bowed in submissive silence to this unreasoning despotism. However free and untrammelled in other provinces of investigation, they paused upon the threshold of man. He was an exceptional instance in the grand scheme of creation, an isolated phenomenon in the great plan of nature, to make free with whom, after the ordinary fashion of inductive inquiry, was little other than an act of open and scandalous impiety. After much conflict, permission was reluctantly accorded to speak of centres of creation, but ethnic areas were still a forbidden topic. On special difference as attaching to brown and white bears, and of organic diversity in relation to African and Asiatic elephants, it was quite lawful to dilate, but an Esquimaux and a European, a Negro and a Persian, were to be invariably treated as of one species. Freedom of inquiry ceased with man. In reference to this crowning glory of creation, there were certain foregone conclusions, with which it behoved none to meddle, under penalties that few cared to incur. Under such circumstances, it is needless to say that ethnology was little more than a name, and that true anthropology was utterly impossible. As a preliminary to all real inductive investigation, it is necessary that the inquirer be free, not only to observe, but also to announce the result of his observations. He must not only question Nature and abide by her decisions, but he must be prepared at all costs to publish his discoveries and promulgate his conclusions. Short of this, inductive investigations are a pretence, and scientific publications a delusion and a snare.

It is in relation to this most important question, freedom of inquiry, and we may add, liberty of speech, on the part of men of science, that the anthropological societies now rising in various parts of Europe are doing such good service to the cause of truth. Composed of the most advanced minds in the countries where they are respectively organised, these bodies present a barrier to fanaticism, and ensure freedom of inquiry and discussion, at least within the limits of their own meetings, and in the pages of their own publications. Here facts can be stated and suggestions can be offered without offence, that would probably raise a storm of prejudiced indignation, even in such quasi-liberal gatherings as those which surround the

British Association at their annual meetings in the provinces. For let us not deceive ourselves; the public, even the educated public, are still unprepared for the full reception of the truth as it is in nature, on the subject of man. They want our statements to be toned down, and our conclusions to be modified into accordance with their limited ideas, ere they will give us a favourable or even an unprejudiced hearing. They have not yet given up their idols. They are still under the dominion of traditional ideas, and in plain language, are too much the slaves of authority to listen without fear to the echoes of a freeman's voice. Nay, this tendency to restrain perfect freedom of utterance on anthropological subjects is not confined to the *vivâ voce* communications of the lecture room, but even pervades a large section of scientific literature, where the practised eye will easily detect the limiting effects of that "pressure from without" which is almost necessarily exercised by a public imperfectly acquainted with the facts and deeply tinctured with prejudices on the entire subject of man and his relationships. Hence, then, the necessity for effective organisation on the part of anthropological inquirers, not merely for the purpose of ensuring freedom of discussion among themselves, but also with the equally important object of supporting a literature devoted to the statement of facts, and the utterance of conclusions too far in advance of existing opinion for their easy reception by the general public, and yet eminently calculated to promote the cause of anthropological inquiry.

And while the first concern of every anthropological society should undoubtedly be to encourage the publication of *original* works, so as to aid in the primary object of adding to our common stock of knowledge, the next should be to promote the *faithful* translation of works, not calculated perhaps to pay in a merely commercial point of view, and yet of great and unquestioned value to the earnest student of ethnology. We have purposely used the epithet *faithful*, for even in the apparently simple matter of translation, suppression and modification have been carried to an extent which augurs but ill for the estimate formed by "the trade" of the liberality, and we may add, the intellectual manhood of the British public. To prepare a scientific continental production for unrestricted circulation in an English dress, its strongest statements, its most powerful arguments, and its most inconvenient conclusions had often either to be discreetly omitted or toned down, so as to take the sting, and with this it may be feared but too frequently the force, out of the entire work, so as to fit it for easy perusal in all the literary nurseries of the United Kingdom. Now, it need scarcely be said, that this is not what the members of our anthropological societies require. They want the truth. They

are afraid of no statements, nor do they stand in dread of any conclusion. They can hear without blenching whatever the strongest Continental has to say, and feel that they are quite competent to the reception of his facts and the digestion of his conclusions, without a careful selection of the former or a timid dilution of the latter.

It is under this aspect that the translations which have already appeared of Waitz and Broca are so valuable to the English student, who may feel assured that he has here a faithful and fearless transcript, not a weak adaptation, of the continental mind on his favourite science. From the pages of these writers he may learn what the anthropologists of other countries really think. By a careful study of these works, he may escape from his insular isolation, and place himself in direct contact with the collective mind of modern civilisation. And, as a farther continuation of this noble plan, we have now to hail the appearance of the work whose title appears at the head of this article. And, we may add, that we accept this last volume as being in an especial manner an earnest of the fearless courage and sterling honesty of the Society at whose instigation and under whose auspices it is published. Waitz, as a respectable monogenist, could offend no body. Even Paul Broca, in his attempted demonstration of the ultimate infertility of hybrids, could only do so by implication. But Dr. Pouchet is offensive in his very title! Nor does that title belie the spirit of his book. It is not only independent; it is antagonistic. Not always contented with holding his own, he sometimes attacks his neighbours, in certain instances perhaps with more zeal than discretion. On this, however, every reader will, of course, form his own opinion; our consolation in the perusal of Mr. Beavan's verbally faithful translation being, that here, at least, we have the veritable sentiments of the author, with whom, therefore, we may agree, or from whom we may differ, with the satisfying consciousness that we are at all events dealing directly with himself, and not with some modified simulacrum, simply bearing his superscription.

If, indeed, there be an error in this otherwise excellent translation, it is not in the faithful rendering of the original, but in the scrupulous carefulness with which the translator, at every available opportunity, informs the reader of the extent to which he differs from his author, more especially on matters involving orthodoxy of opinion. This, we think, is carried to an excess. It encumbers the margin with needless notes, and sometimes painfully distracts the reader's attention from the text. For all the purposes which Mr. Beavan may contemplate in reference to himself, his own preface, with its disclaimers, was amply sufficient, or might have been made so. And as to the Society, they assuredly need not introduce their authorised translations

with an apology. They are above and beyond this, and in the calm consciousness of their noble motives, can afford to smile at the petty criticism, that would assail their proceedings, through the speciality of those foreign authors whom they are the means of introducing to the knowledge of the English public.

But it is time we should proceed to the work itself. As might be expected from the tone of the foregoing remarks, it is essentially liberal. The author commences by discarding sentimental anthropology, and *a priori* conclusions altogether. He argues from the facts of the case, quite regardless of ancient authority or existing prejudice, and if in doing this, he sometimes goes to an opposite extreme, the error is surely pardonable, considering the extent to which all ethnological investigations have been hitherto trammelled by theological dogmas.

As a necessary preliminary to all farther inquiry into man and his attributes, it is obviously desirable to settle his place in the animate scale. Is he a member of the animal kingdom, or the lowly germ of an order of being, superior to, and distinguished from it? On this important point, it strikes us that the facts and reasonings of Dr. Pouchet, though decidedly of a very advanced school, are nevertheless inconclusive and unsatisfactory. The problem is not grasped in its entirety. There are important data omitted, and powerful instrumentalities left unemployed. In saying this, however, we pass no especial judgment on the author, for such remarks will equally apply to nearly all other writers on the same subject. Nor are the causes of this unsatisfactory state of things far to seek; they obviously originate in the very imperfect state of cerebral physiology. With the whole subject of phrenology still *in dubio*, and with our greatest anatomical authorities in almost personal antagonism, what wonder that we can arrive at no satisfactory conclusion as to the place of man in the scale of being? We see in civilisation, with its religion, art, literature, and science, the effects of an intelligence, which we profess to be unable to discover in the organisation, and for whose explanation, therefore, we are driven to education and secondary forces, not perceiving, apparently, that the producing causes of a recurrent phenomenon like civilisation, must be sought in some organic proclivity of the type distinguished by this enduring tendency to culture and refinement. And if this cannot be discovered in the structure, then we may justly surmise that our anatomy or physiology must be at fault—for the facts are against us. It is the same with that grand intellectual distinction between animals and man; that they exist wholly in the concrete, while he occasionally rises to the abstract; that they are on the plane of fact, while he ascends to that of principle. If the cause of

this be not perceptible in the organisation, then the fault must be in the observer. But in truth there is no necessity for putting things in this subjunctive way. The organic source of the difference between man and animals, and even of the observed diversity between various races of men, is perceptible enough to the trained eye and hand of an observer, qualified for accurately estimating the cranial contour and cerebral development of each grand division in the organic scale. In the mean time, the most advanced anthropologists are scarcely prepared for this mode of investigating the subject, and we must not therefore quarrel with Dr. Pouchet because he does not employ it.

In his chapters on the Human Kingdom and on Comparative Psychology, the author cites many weighty authorities and states a variety of convincing facts, to show that the gulf between man and animals is neither mentally or physically so wide as is usually supposed, and embodies the results of his inquiry in the following succinctly stated law:—"From animals to man everything is but a chain of uninterrupted gradations; therefore there is no human kingdom." Now to the proposition, marked in italics, there can certainly be no objection; but what shall we say to the corollary? What, we may ask, will the outsiders think of us, if we allow such logic to pass unquestioned. Why, from the pebble up to man, there is an uninterrupted gradation; nay, from the grain of sand on the sea-shore up to the sun shining in the heavens, there is an uninterrupted gradation. All Nature is one. The whole creation is a vast unity; but must we therefore deny that it is separated into well-marked kingdoms? This is to allow synthesis to dominate analysis to such an extent, as to effectually disqualify us for the clear perception of necessary distinctions, an error of judgment as fatal in its results as the opposite condition of mind, which implies such weakness in the analogical faculty, that close resemblances are overlooked and profound relationships are disregarded. It was, perhaps, unavoidable after the statement of such a law, and, we may add, the manifestation of such reasoning based upon it, that Dr. Pouchet should come to the conclusion, which he does in his chapter on the Bimana, that "Man constitutes a simple family of the order Quadrumana." In a certain sense, it may be said that conclusions are the test of reasoning, and certainly if this of the talented author before us, be not a *reductio ad absurdum*, it approaches very nearly to it. Still, we by no means regret, that it has been so fearlessly stated, and, we may add, by so eminent an authority. The sooner the logic of error arrives at its inevitable terminus the better. Principles and processes must sometimes be seen in their results, if we would estimate the total amount of their perversity; and now that we find ourselves landed in such a practical absurdity as the foregoing,

we may, perhaps, be induced to reconsider the means by which we have been so misled.

In all recent discussions respecting the anatomical resemblance of the anthropoid apes to man, it seems to be forgotten that Nature abounds with transitional links, and that the quadrumana obviously constitute one of these; on their lower side, almost quadrupeds; on their higher, nearly bipeds. Again, it is equally forgotten, that man, even in his highest existent form, the Caucasian, is still but an initial type, only in the process of emergence; ethnically speaking, indeed, but the callow nestling of his order, while the inferior races, more especially the negroid, are still absolutely embryonic. Let us clearly understand, that until this great question of the relative ethnic maturity of orders, genera, and species, approach far nearer to a definite solution than at present, comparative anatomy, physiology, and psychology, can be merely tentative. And, lastly, throughout all these discussions, we have the error almost constantly repeated, of deciding special resemblances and differences from indications afforded by the periphery of effects rather than the causal centre of organic being. Thus we find writers, like our author, dwelling with exaggerated force on the structure of the extremities, while neglecting the stupendous indications afforded by the cerebral hemispheres. And because the foot of man is in certain races slightly prehensile, they confound him with the quadrumana, despite the incalculably important fact, that his brain is four times the weight of that of the gorilla; that its convolutions are immeasurably more complex; and that the relative proportion of its posterior, central, and anterior lobes is such as to indicate a mental constitution, so superior both morally and intellectually, that it is scarcely too much to assert of these two orders of being, that, psychologically, they are radically diverse, the passions and impulses being altogether preponderant in the one, the sentiments and faculties being predominant in the other. We trust that the severity of these remarks will not be misunderstood. We have the greatest possible respect for the labours of Dr. Pouchet, and all who with him have helped to put down the unreasoning despotism of authority; but in our free investigation of man, whether as to his origin or his place, let us not in the fervour of reaction against his undue exaltation, forget the palpable evidences afforded by structure and its correspondent function, of his vast superiority to every other type of terrestrial being.

Ere quitting this department of the subject, we would suggest to anthropologists, more especially in their anatomical and physiological investigations, the important fact that man, more especially in his higher types, is essentially a *cooking* animal. Hence his mouth, even in the negro, bears much too small a proportion to the remainder of the

face, and we may say the cranium, and even the entire organisation, to permit of adequate nutrition solely by the mastication of unprepared food. While it need scarcely be said that this remark applies with still more force to the superior races. Nor would we omit in such a consideration the relative proportion of the abdominal and thoracic viscera, the former apparently diminishing and the latter increasing as we ascend the organic scale, till in the nervo-fibrous temperament of the pure Caucasian we find respiration, and, we may add, cerebation, predominant over both alimentation and reproduction. It need scarcely be said that such data as the foregoing underlie all the more superficial controversies on dietetics, and go down to a depth little suspected by our good vegetarian friends, with their plausible theories, based on frugivorous teeth and a perspiring skin. Let us never forget that the true man, by which we mean the large-brained and small-mouthed Caucasian, performs the first part of his digestion in the pot, and that in virtue of the changes there produced by the fresh agency of *fire*, he constitutes No. 1 in a new alimentary series, where we suspect, data obtained from the gorilla with his stupendous jaws and most respectable paunch, will be found on further investigation, slightly inapplicable.

And while the facts to which we have been just alluding possess considerable value in helping to decide the true place of man in the animate scale, they are also of importance in the minor and subordinate province of racial relationship, and as such have indeed been very judiciously used by Dr. Pouchet, though not perhaps to the extent that might have been expected from his anatomical education. Indeed the proportion of the viscera in different races, and, we may add, in different temperaments of the same race, is a new inquiry, of which we owe almost the beginning to Dr. Pruner-Bey, but which is yet destined to furnish a most important field of inquiry to the more advanced anthropologists of the future. But it is time we should hasten to conclude our remarks on the work before us.

From the general tenor of the foregoing pages, it will be seen that we differ from Dr. Pouchet as to the grade of man, which we think he places too low. Still on such a subject dogmatism on either side would be quite misplaced, and we would rather be understood as indicating data than arriving at a conclusion. The true value of his book, however, is not in this its merely introductory portion, but in his facts and observations on races and their diversity. In the chapter on anatomical, physiological, and pathological varieties, the reader will find a carefully prepared collection of authorities, showing most extensive and varied reading, and constituting indeed an admirable *résumé* of existing knowledge on this department of the subject, and

which yet leaves on the mind the conviction that our travellers want training, and that even professed ethnographers are yet but imperfect observers. Dr. Pouchet here shows not only how much we know, but also of how much we are ignorant. But the conclusion to which every unprejudiced thinker must come after the perusal of this chapter is, that the more we know and the farther we carry our investigations, the more clear and convincing becomes the evidence of diversity. The more intimate our acquaintance with the various races of mankind, and the more profoundly we study their specialities, the more clearly does it appear that they differ, not only in structure and appearance, but also in function, and in susceptibility to disease. Indeed these are but parts of one great whole; for function must harmonise with organisation, and disease is but derangement of healthy function. Thus the negro's skin implies speciality in his emanations, and this, liability to some and freedom from other forms of disease; that skin again being profoundly related to his preponderant liver, and this again implying a peculiar respiratory relationship to carbon and oxygen, eventuating in a predominance of the venous over the arterial system. When we consider that in this way every healthy and rightly-constituted organism, when of pure type and on its own site, is in perfect harmony with itself, that all its powers and functions are perfectly balanced, and that the whole is in due relationship to the atmospheric and telluric forces by which it is surrounded, we shall cease to wonder at the unhealthiness and ultimate infertility of most hybrids, in whom this fine balance is lost, and who are in a sense the product of a generative chaos, that is, of conflicting forces, not constituted by Nature for harmonious conjunction. This also explains the historical disappearance of all colonial extensions of the ancient races on alien areas. While pure they were not in harmony with the telluric forces; when mingled, they were not in harmony with themselves. It is needless to say that these facts involve principles which are prospective in their results, because permanent in their action.

The chapter on the Intellectual and Philological Varieties is good, but far from exhaustive. It obviously wants the hand of a metaphysician and a linguist. But had we even this desideratum, it must be confessed we should still be deficient in the facts on which he might base his conclusions. Of philological ethnology, however, in the sense of defining races by language, independently of organic type, we have already had more than enough. We are glad to see that Dr. Pouchet maintains the sensible thesis, that every race is *relatively* perfect in intellect as in physical organisation, that is, it possesses all the powers requisite for the effective discharge of its peculiar duties

in the scale of being, and that the diversity of these endowments, as between different races, constitutes the harmony of the scale. Such ideas are an immense advance upon the state of things even ten years since, and show how much true anthropology has gained during the intervening period.

We could wish the author had gone somewhat deeper in his remarks on climate. He seems to confine this to atmospheric influences and temperature, neither of which does he think adequate to the entire modification of racial characteristics. But whether under this heading or some other, it is obvious that we want much additional knowledge on the cumulative influence of *place* on racial type. It should be remembered that the earth is a vast magnet, and in the cosmic sense of the term eminently and essentially *vital*. That the vegetable and animal life on its surface is the product of this planetary vitality acted upon by solar influences, and that the earth in this sense is the *mother* of all things living on her surface, whose relative place therefore as to her polar, equatorial, or medium regions must exercise an immense influence on their structure and character. Nor is latitude the only determining condition in this matter. It is obvious, for example, that the plastic forces of the old world are more positive than those of the new, and that perhaps as a result of this, animal life is at its maximum in the former and vegetable life in the latter. It is almost needless to say that these considerations must underlie all attempted definitions of ethnic areas and their effect on race. While at the same time the mere statement of such stupendous problems must show us how far we are from a mastery of the data requisite for their satisfactory solution.

The chapter on Hybridity is ably written, and abounds with profound observations that will amply repay the reader's attention; but after the masterly analysis of the subject by Broca, requires only a passing notice here.

In his remarks on Species the author avows himself a convert to the doctrine of development, or as he phrases it, the theory of *evolution*. Were this the place, we might here venture a few observations on the scientific *conversions* of our day. They are so frequent that individual opinion is beginning to be held as something rather unstable. For a man of eminence to start as the eloquent advocate of one theory and to end as a prominent supporter of another, has become so common, that it almost ceases to excite surprise. We can only say that while there are such phenomena on the surface, there must be some powerful undercurrents in the profounder depths of the scientific mind. From the time of Lamarck, and even before him, the idea of development as opposed to successive fiat of creation,

has been gradually gaining ground. While the earth with all its dependant organisms was thought susceptible of instantaneous projection by an effort of the Divine will, the popular theory of creation was seemingly tenable. But the immense periods of geology, with their organic sequences, implying the *habit* of miraculous interference with the ordinary course of nature, was inevitably fatal to a merely theological dogma so imperfectly based. Let the opponents of development remember that evolution implies *law*, that law implies *order*, and that order is only another name for that "BEAUTY" which has ever been esteemed the best evidence of an indwelling divinity with his resultant harmony and perfection. Rightly viewed, there is nothing atheistic—nothing even irreligious in the theory of development. It merely implies one mode of divine proceeding in place of another. It is moreover purely a question of science, and as such its decision must be left to those who are prepared to investigate the subject through the evidence of fact rather than the authority of dogma. Once for all, then, let us clearly understand that theologians as such, have nothing to do with this great controversy; their attempted meddling with which is an impertinence that the dignity of science can afford to treat with the silent contempt it so richly deserves.

The fundamental error of the advocates of development consists in their supposing that evolution proceeds by a succession of *accidents*. This is a doctrine from every point of view thoroughly untenable. Terrestrial organisms constitute a grand harmonic scale of form and function, obviously evolved in obedience to law and in the fulfilment of a plan. Classes, orders, genera and species, are parts of one great whole. Plants and animals, in short, are *organs* of the earth, and the degree of their development, could we read it aright, would indicate with unerring precision the stage of its maturity. To talk of *accident* in such a matter, is like saying that a man's beard or a lion's mane has come by *chance* at a certain age. Science must not only outgrow such phraseology, but also the vague ideas which have given birth to it. We think that Dr. Pouchet's views on this subject are not only far in advance of Lamarck and the Vestiges, but even of Darwin. But still he does not seem to have fully grasped the idea of law, nor has he a clear and definite conception of the necessary relationship of all subordinate forms of life to the one telluric organism of which they are harmonic parts.

Contemplated only as the highest type of the mammalia, man is still the crowning glory of the earth, and his appearance must have synchronised with some well-marked period in her planetary growth. As a merely initial type still in the process of emergence, much in

him both of form and function must be imperfect, and perhaps even rudimentary, so that in the noblest races he is still a promise rather than a fulfilment. Above all, we cannot expect his special diversities to be so well marked as in those older organic series that have arrived more nearly at ethnic maturity. The bimana are at the beginning of their career, and as the first birds were largely reptilian, so are they more especially in their lower divisions, partially quadrumanous, or if you will, even quadrupedal. Let us not, however, on this account confound them with the inferior plane of organic life, to which they are doubtless related in the order of sequence, but with which they are no more identical than reptiles with fishes. Dr. Pouchet would make a vertebrate kingdom, and if so we may ask, why not an intellectual kingdom? But without going to this extent, we are fully justified in regarding the bimana as a distinct order, perhaps as a separate class, still initial, but to be furnished in due time, with subordinate genera and species, of which existing races are the foreshadowment, if not the actual germ. Let us never forget that specialisation is the surest index of place in the organic scale, and that man is the perfection of this among mammals, his posterior extremities being as essentially locomotive as his anterior are prehensile. And he is the *only* terrestrial being thus characterised, the anthropoid apes being an approach to, but not a fulfilment of this great idea. To the comparative physiologist it is needless to say how all-important is such a fact, the sure index of much else. For this purely prehensile hand is the infallible accompaniment of a proportionately intellectual brain and a correspondently developed nervous system. It is in this logic of correspondences, this ability to perceive harmonic relationships, in which comparative anatomists usually excel, that anthropologists are so often deficient. And it is this want which has permitted Dr. Pouchet to regard the foot of man as truly prehensile, while at the same time he would be willing to admit that his anterior extremities are not in the slightest degree locomotive. Now it is this last fact which shows so clearly that he is at the goal (of specialisation) to which the anthropoid apes, and even the baboons, tend, but which bimanous and intellectual man, the only rational and morally responsible biped in creation, has yet reached.

But it is time we should terminate this lengthened notice. The real merits of the work and the importance of its subject must plead our excuse for such an intrusion on the editor's space and the reader's time. The subject is yet certainly far from being exhausted, and we trust that Dr. Pouchet may be induced, at some future period, to favour us with his more advanced ideas in a third edition. There are points on which we decidedly differ from him, but they are few as com-

pared with those in which we cordially agree with him. And in conclusion, we cannot but congratulate the English student on his possessing this valuable addition to his anthropological library.

ZIMMERMANN'S L'HOMME.*

WE will give the whole title of this curious and interesting book, "L'Homme, problèmes et merveilles de la nature humaine physique et intellectuelle. Origine de l'homme, son développement de l'état sauvage à l'état de civilisation : exposé complet d'anthropologie et d'ethnographie à l'usage des gens du monde. Par le docteur W. F. A. Zimmermann, auteur du 'Monde avant la création de l'homme'. Traduit sur la huitième édition allemande." Verily, the learned doctor promises his readers enough information for any one book, or, indeed, we might say, for any one library, and we must now consider how he has fulfilled his promise. The volume itself is a goodly one, well printed, on fine paper; it contains 796 pages, and is properly illustrated with wood engravings. The subjects of these latter are good, but the execution far from being clear; and, to say the truth, the less said about the "art" portion of the work the better.

The author states in his first chapter the chief objects he wishes to place before the mind of his reader, and he states them as follows:—"The work we now present to the public has for its object the study of man; the study of his physical and moral nature; the study of the mysteries of his first origin; the study of the phases of his development and progress, through the thousands and thousands of years of his existence; the study of the remarkable contrasts and the characteristic traits of the different races of the human species; and in one word, the study of everything which natural science, the traditions of peoples, or history itself have collected from the researches and discoveries with reference to that creature which we call man." As we shall have to consider various points at some length, we will briefly glance at the contents of the first chapters. "Où l'homme a-t-il été créé?" is the title of the first. Concerning this point, we are not told much. Indeed, our author merely gives us an account of the ideas of various nations and peoples concerning the place of man's creation, and provides us with a map in order to illustrate his account of the Mosaic record.

According to a legend taken from the Ezour-Veda, he tells us,

* L'Homme. Par le docteur W. F. A. Zimmermann. Bruxelles, C. Muquart; Paris, Schulz et Thuillie. 1865.